

Can we make an assumption based on the crossings on those roads?

▼ "Sivers, Eric" ---08/24/2010 09:48:06 AM---Lisa- I have the crossings re-evaluated. However, the parallel segments are proving problematic. S

From: "Sivers, Eric" <ESivers@mt.gov>
To: Lisa Kusnierz/MO/R8/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 08/24/2010 09:48 AM
Subject: RE: roads form

The SAP is usually modified after the field work into as "as-built" SAP so we can just incorporate the dataset ownership changes at that point.

It is my understanding from DEQ recommendations after the Little Blackfoot Roads Assessment that we need to uniquely label all of the crossings prior to the field assessment. The label does not need to include information

regarding ownership.

Secondly, if a crossing cannot be assessed in the field, we assess the next closest crossing (assuming it is of similar nature, in this case - gravel, paved or native). Ownership will not be a part of that decision making process.

Thank you!
Kim

-----Original Message-----

From: Siverson, Eric [mailto:ESiverson@mt.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, August 11, 2010 2:57 PM
To: kdraper@wet-llc.com; Kusnierz.Lisa@epamail.epa.gov
Subject: RE: roads form

Kim-

Yes, but with a caveat. There are no 'TBD sites' yet in the layer of 438 crossings, because that attribute comes from the Gallatin County roads layer. The crossings were generated with the statewide framework layer.

Therefore, any crossings in Park County (Lower Jackson Creek) will have ownership/maintenance pulled from the 'System' field of the statewide layer (assuming that seems to make sense). And for whatever reason, the roads don't agree between the two layers in a number of cases, upper Dry Creek in particular.

So, from the above, some more GIS work is necessary to reassign the ownership/maintenance attribute to the entire population of 438. I have already reassigned this attribute with the SAP/fieldwork subset, of course. I'm new to the roads assessment process, but do you need the TPA-wide summary stats prior to going into the field? I don't think I'll be able to tackle this before next week.

Eric Siverson
Hydrogeologist
Source Water Protection Section
Watershed Management Section
Montana DEQ
406.444.0471
406.444.6836 (fax)
esiverson@mt.gov

-----Original Message-----

From: Kim Draper [mailto:kdraper@wet-llc.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 11, 2010 1:54 PM
To: Kusnierz.Lisa@epamail.epa.gov; Siverson, Eric
Subject: RE: roads form

Lisa and Eric,

Hi! Thank you for all of the emails.

Lisa - I really like the DEQ form. It is nice because an 8.5x11 sheet fits nicely on a clipboard in the field. We currently use 11x17 forms.

Here are the changes I will include with the SAP:

- 1) update selected road crossings to reflect new ownership categories;
- 2) update overall statistics per new ownership categories;
- 3) update selected road crossings from TBD to private and state;
- 4) include text that the DEQ form may be used to evaluate crossings and parallel segments; and
- 5) update naming convention to reflect new ownership categories.

Eric - will you assign a maintenance / ownership class to all TBD sites within the 438 crossings in order to run statistics? If so, may we use that layer to name all of the sites before we go into the field?

Thanks,
Kim

-----Original Message-----

From: Kusnierz.Lisa@epamail.epa.gov [mailto:Kusnierz.Lisa@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, August 11, 2010 1:15 PM
To: kdraper@wet-llc.com
Subject: Fw: roads form

Here's the most recent version of the roads form DEQ created.

Lisa Kusnierz
U.S. EPA, Montana Office
10 West 15th Street, Suite 3200
Helena, MT 59626
Kusnierz.Lisa@epa.gov
(406) 457-5001

(See attached file: Roads_Crossing_Field_Form_05_06_10.pdf)(See attached file: Roads_Crossing_Field_Form_05_06_10.xls)